

REMARKS

Upon entry of the forgoing amendments, claims 1-50 are pending in this application with claims 1, 13, 17, 18, 19, 23, 27, 28, 29, 38, and 46 being independent claims. No claim is allowed.

Claims 1, 13, 17, 18, 19, 23, 27, 28, 29, 38, and 46 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification in FIGs. 4 and 5 and on page 12, lines 8-12 and page 14, lines 5-7, among others.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-12, 15, 16, and 50 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. At this time, the Applicant declines the opportunity to rewrite the objected to claims as suggested since it is believed that the discussion below will demonstrate that all of the pending claims are allowable.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 29-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Bui et al.* (US 6,412,007 B1) in view of *Locklear, Jr. et al.* (US 6,252,878 B1) and *Kalajan et al.* (US 6,006,258). Claims 19-28 and 46-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Bui* in view of *Locklear, Wipfel et al.* (US 6,151,688), and *Kalajan*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Generally, the Office Action states that *Bui* discloses or suggests most of the claim elements and limitations and that *Locklear, Wipfel*, and *Kalajan* disclose or suggest the rest.

However, the system disclosed by *Bui* revolves around the user being unique as argued in the Office Action. By contrast, the present claims are directed to ports. Each UIV for a particular port can only be listed once. Given that *Bui* is not directed to ports, then any dispute as to whether *Kalajan* discloses UIVs for ports is moot since *Bui* and *Kalajan* can not be properly combined. Moreover, since *Locklear* lacks any specific details, it fails to fill in any of the deficiencies in the other two references. Consequently, the cited prior art can not be said to render the present claims obvious and the rejections should be withdrawn.

As to dependent claims 2-12, 14-16, 20-22, 24-26, 30-37, 39-45, and 47-50, the arguments set forth above apply equally here. Since the base claims are allowable, then the dependent claims must be allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Dated: July 13, 2004

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax (408) 287-8040